

Application No. 10/800,426

Reply to Office Action

**REMARKS***Discussion of Claim Amendments*

Claim 2 has been amended to define “solvent” as a volatile organic solvent. Claims 119 and 121 have been canceled without prejudice as directed to a non-elected invention. Since claim 115 is dependent upon claim 2, claim 115 has been maintained. Applicants respectfully request that claim 115 should be rejoined and examined. New claims 158-161 have been added and are directed to embodiments of the invention, e.g., claims 145, 17, 45, and 123. No new matter has been added.

*The Office Action*

Claims 2-4, 6, 15, 16, 43, 44, 54-65, 68, 69, 73, 74, 105, 107, 109, 112, 113, 118 and 122 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a), as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,296,275;

Claims 17, 45, 70, 71, 123-126 and 145 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. The Office Action indicates that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

*Discussion of Obviousness Rejection*

Although Applicants disagree with the rejection, Applicants have amended independent claim 2 to recite a volatile organic solvent, thereby rendering the rejection moot. The other rejected claims are directly or ultimately dependent upon claim 2. The cited reference fails to disclose to those of ordinary skill in the art, the presently claimed invention. Since claim 2 is a product claim, which should be allowable, process claim 115, which incorporates the limitations of claim 2, should be rejoined and examined.

Applicants respectfully submit that in view of the foregoing, the obviousness rejection should be withdrawn. Claims 158-161 are also patentable over the cited references.

Application No. 10/800,426

Reply to Office Action

*Conclusion*

The claim amendments place the application in condition for allowance or in better condition for consideration on appeal. Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Xavier Pillai, Ph.D., Reg. No. 39,799  
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.  
Two Prudential Plaza, Suite 4900  
180 North Stetson Avenue  
Chicago, Illinois 60601-6780  
(312) 616-5600 (telephone)  
(312) 616-5700 (facsimile)

Date: March 23, 2006